From: cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org
To: craig-cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: william bowling
Subject: Re: help

Date: 05/21/2009 04:42 PM

```
we are back at the ranch now (ACME) if \ \ you are available for a call? OTherwise, maybe tomorrow. I just know I will feel better once we've
 spoken to you.
 THanks
 Christina
 Quoting Cooper.Craig@epamail.epa.gov:
 > Here is a link to the TASC prime consultant.
 > http://www.e2inc.com/index main.html
> The May 26th Meeting is an informational session so the SSFL community can assess if TASC is the right vehicle for the SSFL community. As you will see from their website, this consultant does not have significant rad expertise. However, on May 26 the TASC consultant will explain the process they will undertake to obtain an appropriate rad technical expert/technical advisor for the SSFL community if the SSFL community decides to proceed. Again, this is an informational meeting to folks can better under this particular program and if its something that may be of value to the SSFL community.

> I share your concerns that the TASC program should NOT be for a single interest or used as a vehicle to attack State laws or cause disunity in the community. I feel very strongly about that.
 > Today has been crazy for me. Can call you later today (approx 4:30pm) or > tomorrow so we can discuss this further?
 > Craig
      Craig Cooper
Superfund Project Manager
U.S. EPA Region 9
(415) 947-4148 (ph)
(415) 947-3520 (fax)
       Christina Walsh <cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org>
       To:
      Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
 > Date:
      05/20/2009 08:18 PM
 > Subject:
 > help
> I am hearing troubling things about next week. Can you please clarify > the intended purpose of TASC? I'm hearing this is all at my request > and that was not how I understood the situation at the time. In > fact, I understood that a request had already been made, and I had a > choice as to whether to participate or not since it would otherwise be > steered by Rowe's views of wanting to downplay the contamination > remaining at the site and her very specific intent to diminish the > need or rightful purpose of the existing state law.
 > I would much rather focus our attention on the issue of adequate
> sampling and looking in all the right places. I'm told by several
> people that this is a request to see if there was really a meltdown
> and finding alternative interpretations of SB990 as has been sent
> around to elected officials as well. I don't see this as a productive
> use of our resources. Can you please clarify what the 'list' of areas
> of expertise and scope of that expertise that is planned to be provided?
 > I gave you my proposed list and wonder if it would be possible to see > the entire list as submitted by all participants?
      Thanks again,
 > 8189225123
```